

REMARKS

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10-13, 17, 20-22, 26-29, 33, 36-38, 42-45 and 49

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10-13, 17, 20-22, 26-29, 33, 36-38, 42-45 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,009,173 issued to Sumner (*Sumner*) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,189,098 issued to Kaliski, Jr. (*Kaliski*). Claims 4, 6, 10-13, 20, 22, 26-29, 42-45 and 49 have been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the rejection of these claims is moot. Applicant submits claims 1, 5, 9, 17, 21, 33 and 37 are not obvious in view of *Sumner* and *Kaliski* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1, 17 and 33 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 29 and/or 42 (including subject matter of intervening claims). Thus, Applicant submits claims 1, 17 and 33, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Claims 5 and 9 depend from claim 1. Claim 21 depends from claim 17. Claim 37 depends from claim 33. Applicant submits claims 5, 9, 21 and 37 are allowable for at least the same reasons claims 1, 17 and 33 are allowable.

Claims 2-3, 14-16, 18, 19, 30-32, 34-35 and 46-48

Claims 2-3, 14-16, 18, 19, 30-32, 34-35 and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sumner* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,824 issued to Persson et al. (*Persson*). Claims 14-16, 30-32, and 46-48 have been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the rejection of these claims is moot. Applicant submits claims 2-3, 18, 19 and 34-35 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth below.

As discussed above, claims 1, 17 and 33 have been amended to include allowable subject matter. Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1. Claims 18-19 depend from claim 17. Claims 34-35 depend from claim 33. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 2-3, 18-19 and 34-35 are allowable for at least the same reasons claims 1, 17 and 33 are allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 8, 23, 24, 39 and 40 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 7, 23 and 39 have been cancelled and the subject matter of these claims has been incorporated into independent claims 1, 17 and 33, respectively. Thus, the objection to these claims is moot. Claims 8, 24 and 40 now depend from these allowable independent claims. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to these claims for at least the reason that they each depend from an allowable independent claim.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5, 8-9, 17-19, 21, 24, 33-35, 37 and 40 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: November 19, 2007



Jared S. Engstrom
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 58,330

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040

(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: November 20, 2007

Signature:



Katherine Jennings